

PRIORITY

(Security Classification)

FOREIGN SERVICE DESPATCH

FROM : USIS TOKYO 29

TO : USIA WASHINGTON

TO : THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE, WASHINGTON

REF : Despatch #56, Oct. 30, 1956; Despatch #118, Feb. 12, 1957

DESP. NO.

November 22, 1960

DATE

4 For Dept. Use Only	ACTION <u>IAF</u>	DEPT. IN <u>1/S 1OP 1OP/L 1OP/N 1R1 1PS 1CS 1BS 1MS 1TV</u>
	REC'D <u>12-6</u>	F OTHER <u>State CIA NSA OSD OCB Army Navy Air</u>

SUBJECT: Assumption of U. S. Military Weakness as Element in Neutralism Argument

The argument that United States military strength is diminishing in comparison with Communist military strength is being used to support Japanese neutralism. The printed debate from the Kahoku Shimpō (Sendai) of November 12, which is attached, contains a specimen of the neutralist reasoning which devolves from a belief in comparative United States weakness. Its advocate, Masakuma Uchiyama, a professor of law at Keio University, is not a leftist by reputation and his opinions are not considered to be designed to serve the political left. His argument is therefore submitted as an example of merely pro-Japanese reasoning.

USIS Tokyo is well aware that Washington has been devoting much thought and effort to counteracting this kind of argument. USIS Tokyo also appreciates the sensitivities involved in such efforts, which are nowhere more delicate than in Japan.

With these in mind USIS Tokyo wishes to make the following proposal, as a measure to counteract the neutralist argument that the U. S. is growing militarily weaker than the communist powers:

That USIA assemble as many as possible newspaper or magazine articles or book chapters written by specialists of high reputation, discussing realistically but affirmatively the relative strengths of the Free World and the Communist forces. These would be sent to USIS Tokyo, copyright cleared if feasible, for unattributed use either in book form or as separate pieces, as is deemed preferable, or for placement.

USIS Tokyo would like very much to support belief in the superiority of over-all United States strength. USIS Tokyo would also wish to heighten a desire among Japanese for commitment and responsibility to the collective security in the free world, by engendering faith in the reliability of the system for deterring Communist aggressiveness and insuring the peace.

USIS Tokyo would appreciate your opinion as to whether or not this approach is possible, and, if it is, would wish to receive a collection of articles as soon as possible.

LP:SKKeogh:nd

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

REPORTER

INFORMATION COPY

Retain in divisional files or destroy in accordance with security regulations.

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Page 2

Despatch No. 29

From USIS Tokyo

Translation (omitting introductory paragraphs) of "Alliance With the Inferior Side Dangerous -- Diplomacy Adapted to the New Age Desired", a neutralist argument printed as part of a debate Nov. 12, 1960, in the Kahoku Shimpō (Sendai):

By Prof. Masakuma Uchiyama, Keio University

.... Arguments over neutralism must be centered upon objective judgment of what is more profitable to Japan; which system, the present or a neutralist one, will guarantee better the security of Japan.

Japan's entry into the U. S. military system is based on one important premise: that the U. S. is militarily stronger than the U.S.S.R. The U. S. was stronger once because of its A-bomb monopoly, and the stationing of U. S. forces in Japan was a guarantee of her security during the occupation days. However, the U.S.S.R. has caught up with the U. S. in A and H bombs and, what is more, it has maintained superiority in missile technology since the Sputnik, as everybody knows. We have just observed Kennedy pressing Nixon hard on the "downfall of American prestige". Furthermore, we cannot remain deaf to Mao's remark on "the East wind overwhelming the West wind".

If we are sufficiently unrealistic to approve of an alliance with the inferior side despite the realities of international relations, we are not in a position to denounce neutralism as mere illusion (a reference to Prime Minister Ikeda's argument against neutralism). Furthermore, with the existing balance of terror in the American-Soviet conflict, is it safe for Japan to have American military bases? Don't these endanger the security of Japan instead of improving it? For U. S. military bases serve as a magnet to draw Soviet atomic attack. There is a danger of Japan being compelled to commit double suicide with the U. S. in an atomic war.

If we enter a collective defense system, we could be drawn into a war simply because of the ties we have made. Not only that, an alliance provokes the opposite side. We should have learned a lesson from that history that saw the Russo-Japanese War coming after the Anglo-Japanese alliance, and the Japan-U.S. War coming after the Tripartite Pact.

Security is relative. We must adapt ourselves to our opponent. Even though we might regard the U.S.S.R. as our enemy, the U.S.S.R. today is different from Stalin's Russia. Khrushchev has chosen the more flexible policy of peaceful coexistence. It is important for us to respond to his approach.

It is unrealistic to adhere to the old attitude of disbelief of the U.S.S.R. when it advocates a Soviet version of the "New Look" and general and comprehensive disarmament. It is natural that we should regard the neutralist road as the formula to safeguard ourselves without provoking the other side. Choice of a neutral stand on the part of Japan is more rational, to say the least, since by maintaining a neutral stand without joining a military bloc Japan can reduce the danger of being attacked by the U.S.S.R. In this space age, it is a matter that requires second thoughts, to entrust our security to an outdated common defense system when the U.S.S.R. has missile superiority.

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

OFFICIAL USE ONLYPage 3
Despatch No. 21
From USIS Tokyo

It is necessary that we compare, with an objective and critical mind, which is the better for us: To lean one-sidedly toward an insecure common military defense setup that is moving in the direction of atomic warfare, or to leave military groupings and take a neutral road in response to the appeal for peaceful coexistence.

It is necessary to recognize that neutralism safeguards the security of Japan better than a collective defense system, and not just criticize it as an evasive opportunism, an unrealistic dream, or pro-Soviet and pro-Communist deviation. Neutralism in the atomic age is a positive formula for peaceful coexistence and it will serve as a buffer between the opposing camps by mitigating international tensions.

Now the helm of U. S. foreign policy is entrusted to the Kennedy administration whose policy is based on a new approach to international relations and a positive attitude towards softening East-West tensions. The cold war faction that advocated balance of power tactics is now out of power and fresh faces have come upon the scene bearing a new era. We hope that Japan's diplomacy also will assume a new and creative posture, so that Japan may not be left behind in the peaceful adjustments which are sure to come. Neutral diplomacy is not a castle in the air, but creative diplomacy suited to the new age.

(Note: Toshio Ueda, Professor, Oriental Studies Institute, Tokyo University, and a specialist on the diplomatic history of China, contributed the argument opposing the neutralist advocate in the newspaper debate. The gist of his argument is that a neutral nation without defensive capabilities will not be able to stay out of a general war, and that therefore, neutralism without self-defense forces, as the Socialists advocate, is not a realistic policy today.)

George M. Hellyer
Counselor of Embassy for Public Affairs

Cleared: POL

OFFICIAL USE ONLY